

BIOETHANOL PRODUCTION FROM CO-
GASIFICATION OF LIGNOCELLULOSIC
BIOMASS AND CHARCOAL

MD. MINHAIJ UDDIN MONIR

Doctor of Philosophy

UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG



SUPERVISOR'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that I have checked this thesis, and in my opinion, this thesis is adequate in terms of scope and quality for the award of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Supervisor's Signature)

Full Name : DR. AZRINA BINTI ABD AZIZ

Position : SENIOR LECTURER

Date :



STUDENT'S DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the work in this thesis is based on my original work except for quotations and citations which have been duly acknowledged. I also declare that it has not been previously or concurrently submitted for any other degree at Universiti Malaysia Pahang or any other institutions.

(Student's Signature)

Full Name : MD. MINHAJ UDDIN MONIR

ID Number : PKE16002

Date :

BIOETHANOL PRODUCTION FROM CO-GASIFICATION OF
LIGNOCELLULOSIC BIOMASS AND CHARCOAL

MD. MINHAJ UDDIN MONIR

Thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements
for the award of the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Faculty of Engineering Technology
UNIVERSITI MALAYSIA PAHANG

MAY 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge my great debt of gratitude to all, who helped me over this research period. I would like to express my thanks to my main supervisor Dr. Azrina Binti Abd Aziz for all kind of mentoring, instructions and supported me enormously throughout my PhD studies. I would also like to thank my previous supervisors Dr. Abu Yousuf and Dr. Risky Ayu Kristanti for their cordial guidance. I wish to give a special thanks to the Prof. Madya Dr. Andri Kusbiantoro, Deputy Dean (Research & Postgraduates Studies), external examiners of Prof. Dr Suzana Binti Yusup and Prof. Dr. Hamidi Abdul Aziz, internal examiners of Prof. Madya Ts. Dr. Che Ku Mohammad Faizal Bin Che Ku Yahya, Dr. Samson Mekbib Atnaw and Dr. Nadzirah Mohd Mokhtar for their effective advice and comments during my PhD proposal defense, pre-viva and viva.

I would like to use this opportunity to express my sincere thanks to the Dean of Faculty of Engineering Technology (FTek), Prof. Dato' Ts. Dr. Zularisam Bin Ab Wahid for his cordial support throughout this work. I also extend my sincere thanks to the responsible persons in the Energy Management Laboratory, Toxicology Laboratory, Chemistry Laboratory and Cell Culture Laboratory for their kind cooperation with various instrumental facilities throughout my whole research. I would always appreciate the valuable support extended by all the academic and technical staff in the FTek. I would like to give cordial thanks to Prof. Dr. Md. Zahangir Alam, Faculty of Engineering, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Malaysia for providing me the microbial sample. I would also like to acknowledge the financial support of GRS Scholarship and PGRS (Internal Grant No. PGRS170370) received from University Malaysia Pahang, Malaysia.

I would like to acknowledge my university (Jashore University of Science and Technology, Jashore, Bangladesh) authority who provided me the permission for my study leave to start my PhD study at Universiti Malaysia Pahang (UMP). Afterward, I would like to convey my hearty thanks to the Dean of Institute of Postgraduate Studies, Prof. Dato' Dr. Hasnah Binti Haron, and all other IPS staffs for their help throughout my study. I also owe my sincere appreciation to all the staff in the International Office (IO) for their timely help and support. Finally, I would like to thanks to my wife who inspired me all the time for the successful completion of my PhD. I would also like to extend my special appreciation to my heartiest parents, sister, nieces, brother-in-law, relatives, friends and colleagues for their cordial support.

ABSTRAK

Permintaan tenaga global kian meningkat disebabkan perindustrian dan perbandaran yang pesat. Oleh itu, peningkatan penggunaan bahan api fosil menjadikan permintaan tenaga global adalah kritikal. Bagi memenuhi permintaan tenaga, pendekatan alternatif adalah wajib. Kajian ini memberi penekanan mengenai pemeliharaan sumber tenaga boleh diperbaharui melalui lignoselulosik biomas (buah kelapa sawit, sisa hutan dan tempurung kelapa kosong) dan keluarannya (arang) untuk pengeluaran syngas dan bioethanol melalui proses hibrid thermokimia dan biokimia. Pencirian fizikokimia bahan bakar dilakukan untuk mengetahui potensi biotenaga mereka. Model simulasi dijalankan untuk mendapatkan keadaan optimum untuk penggabungan bersama berdasarkan beberapa tanggapan dengan menggunakan Aspen Plus® (V 8.6) di bawah keadaan operasi yang berubah (kadar aliran udara, kandungan lembapan dan komposisi bahan baku). Pelbagai campuran biomas dengan arang (0-40%) telah digabungkan bersama dalam gasifier downdraft (DG) untuk pengeluaran syngas. Faktor kawalan (iaitu, suhu, tekanan) reaktor dinilai pada pelbagai parameter iaitu nilai pemanasan, hasil syngas, kecekapan gas sejuk, kecekapan penukaran karbon, kecekapan exergy dan komposisi syngas untuk mengesahkan pengeluaran syngas semasa proses penggalian dengan udara ($\sim 35 \text{ m}^3\text{h}^{-1}$). Selepas itu, penapaian syngas dilakukan menggunakan bioreaktor TFB, dan pengeluaran bioethanol disiasat memandangkan pelbagai kesan (kekotoran syngas, suhu, pH, unit membentuk jajahan, jumlah karbon organik, komposisi syngas). Hasil awal syngas dicirikan oleh pengesan kekonduksian kromatografi gas dan hasil akhir bioethanol telah dikenalpasti oleh spektrometri massa-kromatografi Gas dan resonans magnetik nuklear (^1H). Analisis morfologi kajian ini mendedahkan bahawa dari segi pengegasan, lebih tinggi selulosa dan hemiselulosa yang mengandungi biomas lebih baik daripada arang. Variasi kepekatan reaktor downdraft menunjukkan kepekatan CO dan H_2 meningkat dengan meningkatnya arang (hingga 40%) dan peningkatan suhu ($800\text{-}1000^\circ\text{C}$) serta tekanan ($25\text{-}35\text{bar}$). Sebaliknya, trend yang bertentangan untuk kepekatan CO_2 telah diperhatikan dengan meningkatkan arang dalam reaktor. Walau bagaimanapun, kepekatan CH_4 relatif tidak berubah sepanjang tindak balas beberapa nisbah koefisien. Hasilnya, nisbah syngas optimum ($\text{H}_2\text{: CO}$) untuk tiga pengegasan bersama yang berbeza didapati 1.10-1.55 selepas biomas: campuran arang 70:30 dan 60:40 w/w untuk memaksimumkan faedah pengegasan proses. Secara berterusan, kepekatan pengeluaran bioethanol menggunakan yis (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) dan bakteria (*Clostridium butyricum*) masing-masing adalah 15.28 mmol/L dan 14.97 mmol/L. Oleh itu, biomas lignoselulosa yang terdapat di EFB, FR dan CS dengan arang oleh-produk boleh digunakan untuk penggabungan untuk pengeluaran syngas, dan seterusnya, ia juga sesuai untuk penukaran bioethanol melalui penapaian syngas menggunakan *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* dan *Clostridium butyricum*. Penyelidikan ini boleh menyumbang kepada syngas yang berpatutan dan mesra alam dan tenaga berasaskan bioethanol dan untuk mengurangkan kebergantungan kepada bahan api berasaskan fosil yang terhad.

ABSTRACT

Global energy demand is increasing due to rapid industrialization and urbanization. Moreover, augmented consumptions of fossil fuels make the global energy demand critical. So, to meet up the future energy demand an alternative approach is mandatory. The present study emphasizes on the valorization of mostly available renewable energy resources of lignocellulosic biomass (empty fruit bunch of palm oil, forest residue and coconut shell) and its by-product (charcoal) for the production of syngas and bioethanol through the hybrid process of thermo-chemical (co-gasification of feedstocks to syngas) and biochemical (microbial fermentation of syngas), respectively. The physiochemical characterization of feedstocks was performed to find out their bioenergy potentiality. The simulation model was carried out to obtain an optimum condition for co-gasification based on some assumptions using Aspen Plus® (V 8.6) under variable operating conditions (air flow rate, moisture content and composition of the feedstock). Then various mixtures of biomass with charcoal (0-40%) were co-gasified in a downdraft gasifier (DG) for syngas production. The controlling factors (i.e., temperature, pressure) of the reactor were evaluated on various parameters namely heating value, syngas yield, cold gas efficiency, carbon conversion efficiency, exergy efficiency and syngas composition to verify the production of syngas during the co-gasification process with air ($\sim 35 \text{ m}^3\text{h}^{-1}$). Subsequently, syngas fermentation was performed using a TFB bioreactor, and bioethanol production was investigated considering various effects (syngas impurity, temperature, pH, colony forming unit, total organic carbon, syngas composition). The initial yield of syngas was characterized by Gas chromatography-thermal conductivity detector and the ultimate yield of bioethanol was identified by Gas chromatography-mass spectrometry and Nuclear magnetic resonance (^1H) analysis. Morphological analysis of this study reveals that in terms of gasification, higher cellulose and hemicellulose containing biomass is better than the charcoal. The concentration variation of the downdraft reactor showed that the CO and H_2 concentration increase with the increasing charcoal (up to 40%) with increasing temperature ($800\text{-}1000^\circ\text{C}$) and pressure ($25\text{-}35\text{bar}$). On the contrary, an opposite trend for the case CO_2 concentration was observed with increasing the charcoal in the reactor. However, CH_4 concentration was relatively unchanged throughout the reactions of several co-gasification ratios. Consequently, the optimal yield of syngas ($\text{H}_2\text{:CO}$) ratio for three different co-gasification was found to be 1.10-1.55 after the biomass:charcoal mixture of 70:30 and 60:40 w/w for maximizing the benefits of the gasification process. Successively, the concentration of bioethanol production using yeast (*Saccharomyces cerevisiae*) and bacteria (*Clostridium butyricum*) were 15.28 mmol/L and 14.97 mmol/L, respectively. Thus, the available lignocellulosic biomass of EFB, FR and CS with by-product charcoal could be suited for co-gasification for syngas production, and further, it is also suited for the conversion of bioethanol through syngas fermentation using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *Clostridium butyricum*. This research may contribute to affordable and environment-friendly syngas and bioethanol-based energy and to reduce the dependency on limited fossil-based fuels.

TABLE OF CONTENT

DECLARATION	
TITLE PAGE	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRAK	iii
ABSTRACT	iv
TABLE OF CONTENT	v
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF FIGURES	xii
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xviii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Research Background	1
1.2 Problem Statement	5
1.3 Objectives	6
1.4 Scope of the Study	7
1.5 Significance of the Study	8
1.6 Thesis Outline	9
CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW	10
2.1 Global Energy and Its Demand	10
2.2 Biomass-based Energy	14
2.3 Energetic Utilization of Biomass	17

2.3.1	Syngas	18
2.3.2	Biofuels (Bioethanol)	22
2.4	Lignocellulosic Biomass	23
2.4.1	Types of Lignocellulosic Biomass	25
2.4.2	Composition of Lignocellulosic Biomass	25
2.5	Feedstocks Availability in Malaysia	28
2.6	Energy Conversion Routes from Lignocellulosic Biomass	28
2.6.1	Pyrolysis	29
2.6.2	Combustion	30
2.6.3	Gasification	31
2.6.4	Co-gasification	34
2.7	Simulation, Optimization and Modelling for Biomass Gasification	36
2.7.1	Comparative Analysis Using Simulation Software and Applications	36
2.7.2	Simulation, Optimization and Modelling using Aspen Plus®	38
2.8	Types of Gasifier Used for Gasification and Co-gasification	40
2.8.1	Fixed Bed Gasifier	41
2.8.2	Fluidized Bed Gasifier	44
2.8.3	Entrained Flow Gasifier	47
2.8.4	Selection of Gasifier	49
2.9	Biocatalyst Used for Syngas Fermentation	50
2.10	Syngas Fermentation System	54
2.10.1	Batch Culture	54
2.10.2	Fed-batch Culture	54
2.10.3	Continuous Culture	55
2.11	Microbial Pathway and Energy Conversion	55

2.12	Types of Fermenter Used for Syngas Fermentation	57
2.12.1	Continuous Stirred Tank Bioreactor	57
2.12.2	Bubble Column Reactor	58
2.12.3	Monolithic Biofilm Reactor	59
2.12.4	Trickle Bed Reactor	60
2.12.5	Membrane-based System Reactor	61
2.12.6	Selection of Bioreactor	62
2.13	Syngas Fermentation for Bioethanol Production	62
2.14	Effect of Syngas Fermentation for Bioethanol Production	63
2.14.1	Effect of Microbial Growth Phase	63
2.14.2	Effect of Organic Source	65
2.14.3	Effect of pH	65
2.14.4	Effect of Temperature	65
2.14.5	Effect of Syngas Flow Rate	66
2.14.6	Effect of Mass Transfer	66
2.14.7	Effect of Trace Metals	66
2.15	Summary	66
CHAPTER 3 METHODOLOGY		68
3.1	Samples Collection and Preparation	69
3.2	Feedstocks and Product Characterization	70
3.2.1	Proximate Analysis	70
3.2.2	Ultimate Analysis	71
3.2.3	X-ray Diffraction Analysis	71
3.2.4	Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy-Dispersive X-ray Analysis	72

3.2.5	Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy-Dispersive X-ray Analysis	72
3.2.6	Transmission Electron Microscopy Analysis	72
3.2.7	Fourier Transform Infrared Analysis	72
3.2.8	X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Analysis	73
3.2.9	In-situ Syngas Analysis Using Portable Gas Analyzer	73
3.2.10	Gas Chromatography-Thermal Conductivity Detector Analysis	73
3.2.11	Gas Chromatography-Mass Spectrometry Analysis	73
3.2.12	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance Analysis	74
3.3	Heating Value Calculation	74
3.4	Cold Gas Efficiency and Carbon Conversion Efficiency Calculation	75
3.5	Exergy Analysis	76
3.6	Assumptions for Simulation Using Aspen Plus®	77
3.7	Experimental Setup and Process of Co-gasification	78
3.8	Biocatalyst Preparation for Syngas Fermentation	81
3.8.1	Saccharomyces Cerevisiae Cell Growth Culture	81
3.8.2	Clostridium Butyricum Cell Growth Culture	82
3.9	Experimental Setup and Process of Syngas Fermentation	82
3.9.1	Syngas Fermentation Medium for Saccharomyces Cerevisiae	83
3.9.2	Syngas Fermentation Medium for Clostridium Butyricum	84
3.9.3	Syngas Fermentation Process for Bioethanol Production	84
3.9.4	Product Extraction and Analysis	85
CHAPTER 4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION		87
4.1	Feedstocks Characterization	87
4.1.1	Proximate Analysis	87
4.1.2	Ultimate Analysis	92

4.1.3	X-ray Diffraction Analysis	96
4.1.4	Scanning Electron Microscopy Analysis	98
4.1.5	Field Emission Scanning Electron Microscopy and Energy-Dispersive X-ray Analysis	101
4.1.6	Transmission Electron Microscopy Analysis	103
4.1.7	Fourier Transform Infrared Analysis	104
4.1.8	X-ray Photoelectron Spectroscopy Analysis	105
4.2	Simulation by Aspen Plus®	111
4.2.1	Model Flowsheet for Co-gasification Using Aspen Plus®	111
4.2.2	Mechanism of Simulation for Biomass and Charcoal Co-gasification Using Aspen Plus®	112
4.2.3	Simulation for Lignocellulosic Biomass and Charcoal Co-gasification	113
4.2.4	Experimental Validation with Simulation	114
4.2.5	Economic Analysis Using Aspen Plus®	116
4.3	Syngas Production Through Co-gasification	117
4.3.1	Co-gasification of EFB of Palm Oil and Charcoal	117
4.3.2	Co-gasification of Forest Residue and Charcoal	125
4.3.3	Co-gasification of Coconut Shell and Charcoal	133
4.3.4	Co-product Analysis	141
4.3.5	By-product Analysis	149
4.3.6	Comparative Study on Co-gasification	150
4.4	Bioethanol Production Through Syngas Fermentation	154
4.4.1	Biocatalysts Preparation and Characterization	154
4.4.2	Effect of Syngas Fermentation	156
4.4.3	Bioethanol Production and Analysis	162

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	167
5.1 Conclusion	167
5.2 Recommendations	169
REFERENCES	170
LIST OF PUBLICATIONS	191
APPENDIX A Exergy Efficiency Calculation	202
APPENDIX B Procedure for Simulation USING Aspen Plus®	206
APPENDIX C NMR (¹H and ¹³C) for Co-product Tar	208
APPENDIX D GC-MS Fraction of Ethanol (Standard MS fraction (15:29:31:45) for ethanol (99.99%)).	214
APPENDIX E Syngas Composition Before and After Fermentation	215

LIST OF TABLES

Table 2.1	Types of biofuels and their characteristics.	22
Table 2.2	Potential lignocellulosic biomass source and their composition (% dry weight).	26
Table 2.3	Chemical reactions involved in biomass gasification.	33
Table 2.4	Comparative study on various types of gasifiers including their advantages and disadvantages.	49
Table 2.5	Production of liquid fuels by microbial syngas fermentation with various carbon sources and operational parameters.	51
Table 2.6	Reactions involved for acetic acid and ethanol production.	57
Table 3.1	Aspen Plus blocks with unit assumptions used for simulation of the co-gasification process of lignocellulosic biomass and charcoal.	78
Table 4.1	Proximate and ultimate analytical results of EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal compared to literature.	89
Table 4.2	Elemental weight percentage and the atomic percentage of EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	101
Table 4.3	Experimental results (syngas composition) were validated with simulation results at the temperature of 975°C and pressure 35 bar.	115
Table 4.4	Comparison between experimental and theoretical temperature during the gasification of EFB and co-gasification of EFB with Charcoal.	119
Table 4.5	Comparison between experimental and theoretical temperature during the gasification of FR (100%) and co-gasification of FR (70%) with Charcoal (30%).	127
Table 4.6	Comparison between experimental and theoretical temperature during the gasification of CS (100%) and co-gasification of CS (70%) with Charcoal (30%).	135
Table 4.7	Main chemical compounds of co-product tar produced from the co-gasification of CS and Charcoal.	143
Table 4.8	¹³ C NMR and ¹ H NMR data of co-product tar compounds generated from co-gasification of CS and Charcoal.	145
Table 4.9	¹ H NMR data of bioethanol generated from biocatalysts (<i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>C. butyricum</i>) based syngas fermentation.	165

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 2.1	World energy consumption increases for fuels other than coal.	11
Figure 2.2	Non-OECD countries are projected to account for 64% of the 739 quadrillions Btu worldwide energy consumption by 2040.	12
Figure 2.3	Asia is projected to have significant increase in energy use of non-OECD regions.	12
Figure 2.4	World's total primary energy supply (TPES) from 1971 to 2015 by fuel.	13
Figure 2.5	Fuels shares from 1971 to 2015 by total primary energy supply (TPES).	13
Figure 2.6	Worldwide share of Bioenergy.	14
Figure 2.7	Share of renewables by category on transport, heat demand and electricity generation from 2010 to 2035.	15
Figure 2.8	Scenario of past, present and future bioenergy from 1995 to 2085.	16
Figure 2.9	Biomass feedstocks to the final product of syngas and ethanol for heat and power generation.	18
Figure 2.10	Lignocellulosic bio-conversions into value-added bioproducts.	24
Figure 2.11	Cellulose, hemicellulose and lignin structure of biomass cell.	24
Figure 2.12	Thermochemical and biochemical conversion routes for biomass to biofuels.	30
Figure 2.13	Schematic of the major steps involved in gasification in air and oxygen ambiance.	32
Figure 2.14	Co-gasification process for biomass and coal.	35
Figure 2.15	The flow diagram of the Aspen Plus process model.	40
Figure 2.16	Types of Gasifier used for the production of syngas.	41
Figure 2.17	Schematic diagram of fixed bed gasifiers: (a) updraft gasifier (b) downdraft gasifier (c) crossdraft gasifier.	42
Figure 2.18	Schematic diagram of fluidized bed gasifiers: (a) Bubbling fluidized bed gasifier (b) Circulating fluidized bed gasifier.	45
Figure 2.19	Schematic diagram of entrained flow gasifiers.	48
Figure 2.20	Wood-Ljungdahl pathway of acetogens and their metabolic end products.	56
Figure 2.21	Schematic diagram of continuous stirred-tank reactor (CSTR).	58
Figure 2.22	Schematic diagram of a bubble column reactor (BCR).	59
Figure 2.23	Schematics diagram of Monolithic biofilm reactor (MBR) system for syngas fermentation.	60
Figure 2.24	Schematic diagram of a trickle bed reactor (TBR).	61
Figure 2.25	Schematic diagram of membrane-based system reactor (MSR).	62

Figure 2.26	Microbial growth vs time for syngas fermentation.	64
Figure 3.1	Flowchart of research work plan.	68
Figure 3.2	Raw feedstocks for co-gasification: (a) EFB of palm oil, (b) Forest residue, (c) Coconut shell and (d) Charcoal.	69
Figure 3.3	Experimental setup of downdraft reactor for syngas production: (a) feedstocks (EFB, FR, CS and charcoal), (b) air blower (atmospheric air), (c) rotameter, (d) thermocouples, (e) downdraft reactor (including four zones), (f) gas flare points, (g) cyclone separator, (h) cooling heat exchanger, (i) filter, (j) clean gas sampling point, (k) gas sampling point by gas bag (l) temperature data logger, and (m) computer for data analysis.	79
Figure 3.4	Process for the conversion of syngas from lignocellulosic biomass.	81
Figure 3.5	Experimental setup for bioethanol production through syngas fermentation using yeast and bacteria.	83
Figure 3.6	Process for the conversion of bioethanol from syngas.	85
Figure 4.1	Ternary diagram based on VM, FC and Ash for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	88
Figure 4.2	TGA Curves for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal ('A' zone=Moisture content removal, 'B' zone=Cellulose and Hemicellulose decomposition and 'C' zone=Lignin decomposition).	90
Figure 4.3	DTG curves for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal at a heating rate of 10 °/min.	91
Figure 4.4	Ternary diagram of C, H and O for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	93
Figure 4.5	Van Krevelen diagram at the atomic ratio of H/C and O/C for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	94
Figure 4.6	Higher heating value (MJ/kg) of feedstocks (EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal) compared with literature value.	95
Figure 4.7	Lower heating value (MJ/kg) of feedstocks (EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal) compared with literature value.	95
Figure 4.8	Comparison of X-ray diffraction spectra of feedstock samples (EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal).	97
Figure 4.9	SEM images for feedstock samples: (a) EFB of palm oil (b) Forest residue.	99
Figure 4.10	SEM images for feedstock samples: (a) Coconut shell and (b) Charcoal.	100
Figure 4.11	FESEM and EDX of feedstocks: (a) EFB of palm oil (b) Forest residue (c) Coconut shell (d) Charcoal.	102
Figure 4.12	TEM analysis of feedstocks: (a-b) EFB of palm oil (c-d) Forest residue (e-f) Coconut shell (g-h) Charcoal.	103
Figure 4.13	FTIR Spectrum of EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	105
Figure 4.14	Wide scan XPS curves for EFB, FR, CS and Charcoal.	106

Figure 4.15	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) narrow scan of C1s : (a) EFB of palm oil, (b) Forest residue (FR), (c) Coconut shell (CS) and (d) by-product Charcoal.	107
Figure 4.16	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) narrow scan of O1s : (a) EFB of palm oil, (b) Forest residue (FR), (c) Coconut shell (CS) and (d) by-product Charcoal.	108
Figure 4.17	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) narrow scan of N1s : (a) EFB of palm oil, (b) Forest residue (FR) and (c) Coconut shell (CS).	109
Figure 4.18	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy (XPS) narrow scan of S2p : (a) EFB of palm oil, (b) Forest residue (FR) and (c) Coconut shell (CS).	110
Figure 4.19	Aspen Plus® flowsheet simulation model for the co-gasification process using lignocellulosic biomass and charcoal for a pilot scale Downdraft Gasifier.	112
Figure 4.20	Simulation mechanisms for co-gasification of biomass (EFB of palm oil, forest residue (FR), coconut shell (CS)) and charcoal in a pilot scale downdraft reactor.	113
Figure 4.21	Aspen Plus® simulation based on the parameters of temperature (500-1200 °C) and pressure (1-45 bar): (a) 1 bar (b) 5 bars (c) 15 bars (d) 25 bars (e) 35 bars (f) 45 bars.	114
Figure 4.22	Economic analysis of product syngas using Aspen Plus® simulator.	116
Figure 4.23	Temperature profile of various downdraft reactor zones (drying zone, pyrolysis zone, oxidation zone and reduction zone) with time during the co-gasification of EFB (70%) and charcoal (30%).	118
Figure 4.24	Syngas composition with various ratios of EFB of palm oil and Charcoal (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	120
Figure 4.25	H ₂ and CO yield (%) of syngas produced from co-gasification of EFB of and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	121
Figure 4.26	Syngas ratio (H ₂ :CO) during the co-gasification of EFB of palm oil and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	122
Figure 4.27	The syngas flame appearance of raw syngas (a) purified based syngas (b) during the co-gasification of EFB (70%) and Charcoal (30%).	123
Figure 4.28	Exergy efficiency during the co-gasification of EFB of palm oil and charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	124
Figure 4.29	HHV (a) and LHV (b) of Syngas during the co-gasification of EFB of palm oil and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	125

Figure 4.30	Temperature profile of various downdraft reactor zones (drying zone, pyrolysis zone, oxidation zone and reduction zone) with time during the co-gasification of FR (70%) and Charcoal (30%).	126
Figure 4.31	Syngas composition with various ratios of FR and Charcoal (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	128
Figure 4.32	H ₂ and CO yield (%) of syngas produced from co-gasification of FR and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	129
Figure 4.33	Syngas ratio (H ₂ :CO) during the co-gasification of FR and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	130
Figure 4.34	The flame appearance of raw and purified syngas during the co-gasification of FR (70%) and Charcoal (30%).	131
Figure 4.35	Exergy efficiency during the co-gasification of FR and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	132
Figure 4.36	HHV (a) and LHV (b) of Syngas during the co-gasification of FR and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	133
Figure 4.37	Temperature profile of various downdraft reactor zones (drying zone, pyrolysis zone, oxidation zone and reduction zone) with time during the co-gasification of CS (70%) and Charcoal (30%).	134
Figure 4.38	Syngas composition with various ratios of CS and Charcoal (100:0; 90:10; 80:20, 70:30 and 60:40).	136
Figure 4.39	Syngas ratio (H ₂ :CO) during the co-gasification of CS and Charcoal at various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20, 70:30 and 60:40).	137
Figure 4.40	Syngas ratio (H ₂ :CO) during the co-gasification of CS and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20; 70:30 and 60:40).	138
Figure 4.41	The syngas flame appearance of raw (a) and purified (b) based syngas during the co-gasification of CS (70%) and Charcoal (30%).	139
Figure 4.42	Exergy efficiency for co-gasification of CS and Charcoal with the ratios of 100:0, 90:10, 80:20, 70:30 and 60:40.	140
Figure 4.43	HHV (a) and LHV (b) of Syngas during the co-gasification of CS and Charcoal with various ratios (100:0; 90:10; 80:20, 70:30 and 60:40).	141
Figure 4.44	Tar separation process from raw syngas (collected from co-gasification of CS and Charcoal).	142
Figure 4.45	SEM image with EDX of raw co-product tar produced from co-gasification of CS and Charcoal in the downdraft reactor.	144
Figure 4.46	GC-MS chromatogram of co-product tar produced from the co-gasification of CS and Charcoal.	144

Figure 4.47	SEM images of tar samples after thermal treatment: (a) at 700 °C (b) at 800 °C.	146
Figure 4.48	SEM images of tar samples after thermal treatment: (a) at 900 °C (b) at 1000 °C.	147
Figure 4.49	FTIR spectra of tar sample obtained from the co-gasification process: (a) before thermal treatment (b) thermal treatment at 700 °C (c) thermal treatment at 800 °C (d) thermal treatment at 900 °C and (d) thermal treatment at 1000 °C.	148
Figure 4.50	Oxides of by-product of charcoal produced from co-gasification of biomass and charcoal.	149
Figure 4.51	Comparative study on syngas concentration on the co-gasification of EFB with charcoal, FR with charcoal and CS with charcoal (70:30).	151
Figure 4.52	Comparative study on cold gas efficiency on the co-gasification of EFB with charcoal, FR with charcoal and CS with charcoal (70:30).	152
Figure 4.53	Comparative carbon conversion efficiency on the co-gasification of EFB with charcoal, FR with charcoal and CS with charcoal (70:30).	152
Figure 4.54	Comparative study on the heating value of syngas on the co-gasification of EFB with charcoal, FR with charcoal and CS with charcoal (70:30).	153
Figure 4.55	Growth Culture of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> in Petridish and Slant.	154
Figure 4.56	FESEM images of <i>S. cerevisiae</i> : (a) group of the colony (b) single colony.	155
Figure 4.57	Growth Culture of <i>C. butyricum</i> : (a) before inoculation (b) after inoculation at 37 °C for 24 h.	156
Figure 4.58	FESEM images of <i>C. butyricum</i> : (a) group of the colony (b) single colony.	156
Figure 4.59	Effect of treated and untreated syngas on CFU during <i>S. cerevisiae</i> based syngas fermentation.	157
Figure 4.60	Effect of treated and untreated syngas on CFU during <i>C. butyricum</i> syngas fermentation.	158
Figure 4.61	Temperature effect on syngas fermentation.	159
Figure 4.62	Effect of pH on syngas fermentation.	160
Figure 4.63	Effect of TOC on syngas fermentation.	161
Figure 4.64	Effect of syngas composition before and after syngas fermentation.	162
Figure 4.65	Syngas fermentation using <i>Saccharomyces Cerevisiae</i> : (a) ¹ H NMR, 500 MHz (CDCl ₃): δ = 3.75 (q, J = 7.00 Hz, 2H [CH ₂]), 2.19 (s, 1H [OH]), 1.28 (t, J = 3.70 Hz, 3H [CH ₃]). (b) S.	

	cerevisiae-based bioethanol MS fraction (15.01:29.03:31.02:45.01).	163
Figure 4.66	Syngas fermentation using <i>Clostridium Butyricum</i> : (a) ¹ H NMR, 500 MHz (CDCl ₃): δ = 3.75 (q, J = 7.00 Hz, 2H [CH ₂]), 2.20 (s, 1H [OH]), 1.27 (t, J = 7.00 Hz, 3H [CH ₃]). (b) <i>C. butyricum</i> -based bioethanol MS fraction (15.02:29.01:31.00:45.01).	164
Figure 4.67	Bioethanol concentration from syngas fermentation using <i>S. cerevisiae</i> and <i>C. butyricum</i> .	165

LIST OF SYMBOLS

°C	degree centigrade
g	gram
cm ⁻¹	per centimetre
h	hour
L	litre
µm	micrometre
mg	milligram
ml	millilitre
mmol	millimole
mol	mole
mol L ⁻¹	mole per litre
nm	nanometre
%	percentage
sec	second
cm ²	square of centimetre
mol%	mole percentage

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

EFB	Empty fruit bunch (of palm oil)
FR	Forest residue
CS	Coconut shell
MC	Moisture content
VM	Volatile matter
FC	Fixed carbon
AC	Ash content
S.C	<i>Saccharomyces Cerevisiae</i>
C.B	<i>Clostridium Butyricum</i>
TGA/DTG	Thermogravimetric and derivative thermogravimetry analysis
CHNS	Carbon, hydrogen, nitrogen and sulphur
FTIR	Fourier-transform infrared spectroscopy
XPS	X-ray photoelectron spectroscopy
XRD	X-ray diffractometer
XRF	X-ray fluorescence
SEM-EDX	Scanning electron microscopy with energy dispersive x-ray spectroscopy
FESEM-EDX	Field emission scanning microscopy-energy dispersive x-ray analysis
TEM	Transmission electron microscopy
NMR	Nuclear magnetic resonance

REFERENCES

- Abdoulmoumine, N., Adhikari, S., Kulkarni, A., & Chattanathan, S. (2015). A review on biomass gasification syngas cleanup. *Applied Energy*, 155, 294-307. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2015.05.095
- Abubackar, H. N., Veiga, M. C., & Kennes, C. (2018). Production of acids and alcohols from syngas in a two-stage continuous fermentation process. *Bioresource Technology*, 253, 227-234. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2018.01.026
- Acharya, B., Roy, P., & Dutta, A. (2014). Review of syngas fermentation processes for bioethanol. *Biofuels*, 5(5), 551-564.
- Adeyemi, I., Janajreh, I., Arink, T., & Ghenai, C. (2017). Gasification behavior of coal and woody biomass: Validation and parametrical study. *Applied Energy*, 185, 1007-1018.
- Adhikari, S., Abdoulmoumine, N., Nam, H., & Oyedepi, O. (2017). 16 - Biomass gasification producer gas cleanup. In *Bioenergy Systems for the Future* (pp. 541-557): Woodhead Publishing.
- Ahmad, A. A., Zawawi, N. A., Kasim, F. H., Inayat, A., & Khasri, A. (2016). Assessing the gasification performance of biomass: A review on biomass gasification process conditions, optimization and economic evaluation. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 53, 1333-1347. doi:http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.09.030
- Akhtar, M. N. (2016). Biofuel: A Stepping Stone towards Sustainable Development. *International Journal of Research in BioSciences*, 5(3), 1-12.
- Al-Rahbi, A. S., & Williams, P. T. (2017). Hydrogen-rich syngas production and tar removal from biomass gasification using sacrificial tyre pyrolysis char. *Applied Energy*, 190, 501-509. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.12.099
- Alfenore, S., & Molina-Jouve, C. (2016). Current status and future prospects of conversion of lignocellulosic resources to biofuels using yeasts and bacteria. *Process Biochemistry*, 51(11), 1747-1756.
- Ali, D. A., Gadalla, M. A., Abdelaziz, O. Y., Hulteberg, C. P., & Ashour, F. H. (2017). Co-gasification of coal and biomass wastes in an entrained flow gasifier: Modelling, simulation and integration opportunities. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering*, 37, 126-137.
- Alzate, C. A. C., Toro, J. C. S., & Peña, Á. G. (2018). Fermentation, thermochemical and catalytic processes in the transformation of biomass through efficient biorefineries. *Catalysis today*, 302, 61-72.
- Anex, R. P., Aden, A., Kazi, F. K., Fortman, J., Swanson, R. M., Wright, M. M., . . . Dutta, A. (2010). Techno-economic comparison of biomass-to-transportation

- fuels via pyrolysis, gasification, and biochemical pathways. *Fuel*, 89, S29-S35. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2010.07.015>
- Anil, M., Rupesh, S., Muraleedharan, C., & Arun, P. (2016). Performance Evaluation of Fluidised Bed Biomass Gasifier Using CFD. *Energy Procedia*, 90, 154-162. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2016.11.180>
- Anukam, A., Mamphweli, S., Reddy, P., Meyer, E., & Okoh, O. (2016). Pre-processing of sugarcane bagasse for gasification in a downdraft biomass gasifier system: A comprehensive review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 66, 775-801. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.08.046>
- Arevalo-Gallegos, A., Ahmad, Z., Asgher, M., Parra-Saldivar, R., & Iqbal, H. M. (2017). Lignocellulose: A sustainable material to produce value-added products with a zero waste approach—A review. *International journal of biological macromolecules*, 99, 308-318.
- Asimakopoulou, K., Gavala, H. N., & Skiadas, I. V. (2018). Reactor systems for syngas fermentation processes: A review. *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 348, 732-744. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cej.2018.05.003>
- Atia, A. (2016). Modeling and simulation of coupling enhanced Oil/Gas recovery with CO₂ injection.
- Atnaw, S. M., Kueh, S. C., & Sulaiman, S. A. (2014). Study on tar generated from downdraft gasification of oil palm fronds. *The Scientific World Journal*, 2014.
- Atnaw, S. M., Sulaiman, S. A., Singh, L., Wahid, Z. A., Che, C. K. M. F. B., & Yahya, K. (2017). Modeling and Parametric Study for Maximizing Heating Value of Gasification Syngas. *BioResources*, 12(2), 2548-2564.
- Atnaw, S. M., Sulaiman, S. A., & Yusup, S. (2011). A simulation study of downdraft gasification of oil-palm fronds using ASPEN PLUS. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 11(11), 1913-1920.
- Atnaw, S. M., Sulaiman, S. A., & Yusup, S. (2013). Syngas production from downdraft gasification of oil palm fronds. *Energy*, 61, 491-501. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2013.09.039>
- Atnaw, S. M., Sulaiman, S. A., & Yusup, S. (2017). Biomass Gasification. In *Waste Biomass Management—A Holistic Approach* (pp. 159-185): Springer.
- Aydin, E. S., Yucel, O., & Sadikoglu, H. (2018). Numerical Investigation of Fixed-Bed Downdraft Woody Biomass Gasification. In *Exergetic, Energetic and Environmental Dimensions* (pp. 323-339): Elsevier.
- Baharuddin, A. S., Sulaiman, A., Kim, D. H., Mokhtar, M. N., Hassan, M. A., Wakisaka, M., . . . Nishida, H. (2013). Selective component degradation of oil palm empty fruit bunches (OPEFB) using high-pressure steam. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 55(Supplement C), 268-275. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.02.013>

- Bahng, M.-K., Mukarakate, C., Robichaud, D. J., & Nimlos, M. R. (2009). Current technologies for analysis of biomass thermochemical processing: A review. *Analytica Chimica Acta*, 651(2), 117-138. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aca.2009.08.016
- Baidya, T., Cattolica, R. J., & Seiser, R. (2018). High performance Ni-Fe-Mg catalyst for tar removal in producer gas. *Applied Catalysis A: General*, 558, 131-139. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apcata.2018.03.026
- Baruah, D., & Baruah, D. C. (2014). Modeling of biomass gasification: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 39, 806-815. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.07.129
- Basu, P. (2010). *Biomass gasification and pyrolysis: practical design and theory*: Academic press.
- Basu, P. (2018). *Biomass gasification, pyrolysis and torrefaction: practical design and theory*: Academic press.
- Beagle, E., Wang, Y., Bell, D., & Belmont, E. (2018). Co-gasification of pine and oak biochar with sub-bituminous coal in carbon dioxide. *Bioresource Technology*, 251, 31-39. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.12.027
- Bhaskar, T., Bhavya, B., Singh, R., Naik, D. V., Kumar, A., & Goyal, H. B. (2011). Chapter 3 - Thermochemical Conversion of Biomass to Biofuels A2 - Pandey, Ashok. In C. Larroche, S. C. Ricke, C.-G. Dussap, & E. Gnansounou (Eds.), *Biofuels* (pp. 51-77). Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- Birol, F. (2017). Key world energy statistics. In: IEA Publications, International Energy Agency, rue de la Federation, Paris, France.
- Brown, T. R., Thilakaratne, R., Brown, R. C., & Hu, G. (2013). Techno-economic analysis of biomass to transportation fuels and electricity via fast pyrolysis and hydroprocessing. *Fuel*, 106, 463-469. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2012.11.029
- Buruiana, C.-T., Vizireanu, C., Garrote, G., & Parajó, J. C. (2014). Bioethanol production from hydrothermally pretreated and delignified corn stover by fed-batch simultaneous saccharification and fermentation. *Energy & Fuels*, 28(2), 1158-1165.
- Cai, J., He, Y., Yu, X., Banks, S. W., Yang, Y., Zhang, X., . . . Bridgwater, A. V. (2017). Review of physicochemical properties and analytical characterization of lignocellulosic biomass. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 76, 309-322. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.03.072
- Cai, J., Wang, S., Wang, Q., & Kuang, C. (2016). The characteristics of biomass gasification in multistage heating and gradient chain gasifier. *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 41(35), 15674-15681. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.04.128

- Cai, Y., Yang, X., Liang, T., Dai, L., Ma, L., Huang, G., . . . Xu, M. (2014). Easy incorporation of single-walled carbon nanotubes into two-dimensional MoS₂ for high-performance hydrogen evolution. *Nanotechnology*, 25(46), 465401.
- Capuano, L. (2018). International Energy Outlook 2018 (IEO2018). Available from: https://www.eia.gov/outlooks/ieo/executive_summary.php.
- Casolari, A. (2018). Microbial death. In *Physiological models in microbiology* (pp. 1-44): CRC press.
- Catalán-Martínez, D., Domínguez, M. E., & Serra, J. M. (2018). Liquid fuels from biomass: An energy self-sustained process integrating H₂ recovery and liquid refining. *Fuel*, 212(Supplement C), 353-363. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.10.014>
- Chala, G. T., Lim, Y. P., Sulaiman, S. A., & Liew, C. L. (2018). *Thermogravimetric analysis of empty fruit bunch*. Paper presented at the MATEC Web of Conferences.
- Channiwala, S. A., & Parikh, P. P. (2002). A unified correlation for estimating HHV of solid, liquid and gaseous fuels. *Fuel*, 81(8), 1051-1063. doi:[http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0016-2361\(01\)00131-4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0016-2361(01)00131-4)
- Chaurasia, A. (2018). Modeling of downdraft gasification process: Studies on particle geometries in thermally thick regime. *Energy*, 142, 991-1009. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.10.093>
- Che, D., Li, S., Yang, W., Jia, J., & Zheng, N. (2012). Application of Numerical Simulation on Biomass Gasification. *Energy Procedia*, 17, 49-54. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2012.02.061>
- Chen, F., Srinivasa Reddy, M. S., Temple, S., Jackson, L., Shadle, G., & Dixon, R. A. (2006). Multi-site genetic modulation of monolignol biosynthesis suggests new routes for formation of syringyl lignin and wallbound ferulic acid in alfalfa (*Medicago sativa* L.). *Plant Journal*, 48(1), 113-124. doi:10.1111/j.1365-313X.2006.02857.x
- Chen, H. (2014). Chemical composition and structure of natural lignocellulose. In *Biotechnology of lignocellulose* (pp. 25-71): Springer.
- Chen, J., & Henson, M. A. (2016). In silico metabolic engineering of *Clostridium ljungdahlii* for synthesis gas fermentation. *Metabolic engineering*, 38, 389-400. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2016.10.002>
- Claypool, J. T., & Simmons, C. W. (2016). Hybrid thermochemical/biological processing: The economic hurdles and opportunities for biofuel production from bio-oil. *Renewable Energy*, 96, 450-457. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.04.095>

- Clews, R. J. (2016). Chapter 7 - Petroleum Refining. In R. J. Clews (Ed.), *Project Finance for the International Petroleum Industry* (pp. 119-136). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Collet, C., Ng, J. Y., & Aston, D. N. (2018). Multiple reactor system for continuous gas fermentation. In: Google Patents.
- Dalena, F., Senatore, A., Tursi, A., & Basile, A. (2017). 17 - Bioenergy production from second- and third-generation feedstocks. In *Bioenergy Systems for the Future* (pp. 559-599): Woodhead Publishing.
- Darmawan, A., Hardi, F., Yoshikawa, K., Aziz, M., & Tokimatsu, K. (2017). Enhanced process Integration of entrained flow gasification and combined cycle: modeling and simulation using Aspen Plus. *Energy Procedia*, 105, 303-308.
- Davis, R., Molloy, S., Quigley, B., Nikodinovic-Runic, J., Solano, F., O'Connor, K. E. J. A. m., & biotechnology. (2018). Biocatalytic versatility of engineered and wild-type tyrosinase from *R. solanacearum* for the synthesis of 4-halocatechols. 1-11.
- De, S., Agarwal, A. K., Moholkar, V., & Thallada, B. (2018). Coal and Biomass Gasification. *Energy, Environment, and Sustainability*.
- Derman, E., Abdulla, R., Marbawi, H., & Sabullah, M. K. (2018). Oil palm empty fruit bunches as a promising feedstock for bioethanol production in Malaysia. *Renewable Energy*, 129, 285-298. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2018.06.003>
- Devarapalli, M., Atiyeh, H. K., Phillips, J. R., Lewis, R. S., & Huhnke, R. L. (2016). Ethanol production during semi-continuous syngas fermentation in a trickle bed reactor using *Clostridium ragsdalei*. *Bioresource Technology*, 209, 56-65. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.02.086>
- Drzyzga, O., Revelles, O., Durante-Rodriguez, G., Diaz, E., Garcia, J. L., & Prieto, A. (2015). New challenges for syngas fermentation: towards production of biopolymers. *Journal of Chemical Technology and Biotechnology*, 90(10), 1735-1751. doi:10.1002/jctb.4721
- Du, S.-W., Chen, W.-H., & Lucas, J. A. (2014). Pretreatment of biomass by torrefaction and carbonization for coal blend used in pulverized coal injection. *Bioresource Technology*, 161, 333-339. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2014.03.090>
- Edrisi, S. A., & Abhilash, P. (2016). Exploring marginal and degraded lands for biomass and bioenergy production: an Indian scenario. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 54, 1537-1551.
- Ellabban, O., Abu-Rub, H., & Blaabjerg, F. (2014). Renewable energy resources: Current status, future prospects and their enabling technology. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 39, 748-764.

- Emami-Tabataba, L., Irfan, M. F., Wan Daud, W. M. A., & Chakrabarti, M. H. (2013). Fuel blending effects on the co-gasification of coal and biomass – A review. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 57, 249-263. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.02.043>
- Fermoso, J., Arias, B., Plaza, M. G., Pevida, C., Rubiera, F., Pis, J. J., . . . Casero, P. (2009). High-pressure co-gasification of coal with biomass and petroleum coke. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 90(7), 926-932. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuproc.2009.02.006>
- Foo, J. L., Susanto, A. V., Keasling, J. D., Leong, S. S. J., Chang, M. W. J. B., & bioengineering. (2017). Whole - cell biocatalytic and de novo production of alkanes from free fatty acids in *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. 114(1), 232-237.
- Furuoka, F. (2017). Renewable electricity consumption and economic development: New findings from the Baltic countries. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 71, 450-463. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.12.074>
- Gaikwad, V., Panghal, A., Jadhav, S., Sharma, P., Bagal, A., Jadhav, A., & Chhikara, N. (2018). Designing of Fermenter and its utilization in food industries.
- Gao, X., Zhang, Y., Li, B., & Yu, X. (2016). Model development for biomass gasification in an entrained flow gasifier using intrinsic reaction rate submodel. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 108, 120-131.
- Gaurav, N., Sivasankari, S., Kiran, G. S., Ninawe, A., & Selvin, J. (2017). Utilization of bioresources for sustainable biofuels: A Review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 73, 205-214. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.070>
- Gírio, F. M., Fonseca, C., Carvalheiro, F., Duarte, L. C., Marques, S., & Bogel-Lukasik, R. (2010). Hemicelluloses for fuel ethanol: A review. *Bioresource Technology*, 101(13), 4775-4800. doi:10.1016/j.biortech.2010.01.088
- Gogoi, M., Konwar, K., Bhuyan, N., Borah, R. C., Kalita, A. C., Nath, H. P., & Saikia, N. (2018). Assessments of pyrolysis kinetics and mechanisms of biomass residues using thermogravimetry. *Bioresource Technology Reports*, 4, 40-49. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biteb.2018.08.016>
- Guan, G., Kaewpanha, M., Hao, X., & Abudula, A. (2016). Catalytic steam reforming of biomass tar: Prospects and challenges. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 58, 450-461. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.12.316>
- Guangul, F. M., Sulaiman, S. A., & Ramli, A. (2012). Gasifier selection, design and gasification of oil palm fronds with preheated and unheated gasifying air. *Bioresource Technology*, 126, 224-232. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2012.09.018>
- Gupta, J. G., De, S., Gautam, A., Dhar, A., & Pandey, A. (2018). Introduction to Sustainable Energy, Transportation Technologies, and Policy. In A. Gautam, S. De, A. Dhar, J. G. Gupta, & A. Pandey (Eds.), *Sustainable Energy and*

Transportation : Technologies and Policy (pp. 3-7). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

- Hagos, F. Y., Aziz, A. R. A., & Sulaiman, S. A. (2013). Study of syngas combustion parameters effect on internal combustion engine. *Asian Journal of Scientific Research*, 6(2), 187-196.
- Haq, F., Ali, H., Shuaib, M., Badshah, M., Hassan, S. W., Munis, M. F. H., & Chaudhary, H. J. (2016). Recent progress in bioethanol production from lignocellulosic materials: A review. *International Journal of Green Energy*, 13(14), 1413-1441.
- Hassan, H., Lim, J., & Hameed, B. (2016). Recent progress on biomass co-pyrolysis conversion into high-quality bio-oil. *Bioresource Technology*.
- Heiskanen, H., Virkajärvi, I., & Viikari, L. (2007). The effect of syngas composition on the growth and product formation of *Butyribacterium methylotrophicum*. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 41(3), 362-367.
- Henstra, A. M., Sipma, J., Rinzema, A., & Stams, A. J. M. (2007). Microbiology of synthesis gas fermentation for biofuel production. *Current Opinion in Biotechnology*, 18(3), 200-206. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copbio.2007.03.008>
- Hoffmeister, S., Gerdorf, M., Bengelsdorf, F. R., Linder, S., Flüchter, S., Öztürk, H., . . . Bahl, H. (2016). Acetone production with metabolically engineered strains of *Acetobacterium woodii*. *Metabolic engineering*, 36, 37-47.
- Holland, D. J. (2015). 18 - Applications of tomography in bubble column and trickle bed reactors A2 - Wang, Mi. In *Industrial Tomography* (pp. 477-507): Woodhead Publishing.
- Hossain, N., Zaini, J. H., & Mahlia, T. (2017). A Review of Bioethanol Production from Plant-based Waste Biomass by Yeast Fermentation. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TECHNOLOGY*, 8(1), 5-18.
- Hu, M., Laghari, M., Cui, B., Xiao, B., Zhang, B., & Guo, D. (2018). Catalytic cracking of biomass tar over char supported nickel catalyst. *Energy*, 145, 228-237. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.12.096>
- Ibarra-Gonzalez, P., & Rong, B.-G. (2018). A review of the current state of biofuels production from lignocellulosic biomass using thermochemical conversion routes. *Chinese Journal of Chemical Engineering*.
- Inayat, A., Ahmad, M. M., Mutalib, M. A., & Yusup, S. (2010). Effect of process parameters on hydrogen production and efficiency in biomass gasification using modelling approach. *Journal of Applied Sciences(Faisalabad)*, 10(24), 3183-3190.
- Inderwildi, O. R., & King, D. A. (2009). Quo vadis biofuels? *Energy Environ. Sci.*, 2(4), 343-346.

- Isikgor, F. H., & Becer, C. R. (2015). Lignocellulosic biomass: a sustainable platform for the production of bio-based chemicals and polymers. *Polymer Chemistry*, 6(25), 4497-4559. doi:10.1039/c5py00263j
- Islam, M. A., Yousuf, A., Karim, A., Pirozzi, D., Khan, M. R., & Wahid, Z. A. (2018). Bioremediation of palm oil mill effluent and lipid production by *Lipomyces starkeyi*: A combined approach. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 172, 1779-1787. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2017.12.012
- Ismail, H. Y., Abbas, A., Azizi, F., & Zeaiter, J. (2017). Pyrolysis of waste tires: A modeling and parameter estimation study using Aspen Plus®. *Waste Management*, 60, 482-493.
- Janda, K., & Tan, T. (2017). Overview of Sustainable Energy in Central Europe and East Asia.
- Jin, E., & Sutherland, J. W. (2018). An integrated sustainability model for a bioenergy system: Forest residues for electricity generation. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 119, 10-21. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.09.005
- Johar, N., Ahmad, I., & Dufresne, A. (2012). Extraction, preparation and characterization of cellulose fibres and nanocrystals from rice husk. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 37(1), 93-99.
- Kalita, P., & Baruah, D. (2018). Investigation of Biomass Gasifier Product Gas Composition and its Characterization. In *Coal and Biomass Gasification* (pp. 115-149): Springer.
- Kaman, S. P. D., Tan, I. A. W., & Lim, L. L. P. (2017). Palm oil mill effluent treatment using coconut shell – based activated carbon: Adsorption equilibrium and isotherm. *MATEC Web Conf.*, 87, 03009. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/20178703009
- Kamble, A. D., Saxena, V. K., Chavan, P. D., & Mendhe, V. A. (2018). Co-gasification of coal and biomass an emerging clean energy technology: Status and prospects of development in Indian context. *International Journal of Mining Science and Technology*. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijmst.2018.03.011
- Kanchanasuta, S., Prommeenate, P., Boonapatcharone, N., & Pisutpaisal, N. (2017). Stability of *Clostridium butyricum* in biohydrogen production from non-sterile food waste. *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 42(5), 3454-3465. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2016.09.111
- Kang, K., Azargohar, R., Dalai, A. K., & Wang, H. (2016). Hydrogen production from lignin, cellulose and waste biomass via supercritical water gasification: Catalyst activity and process optimization study. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 117, 528-537. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2016.03.008

- Kaushal, P., & Tyagi, R. (2017a). Advanced simulation of biomass gasification in a fluidized bed reactor using ASPEN PLUS. *Renewable Energy*, 101, 629-636. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.09.011>
- Kaushal, P., & Tyagi, R. (2017b). Advanced simulation of biomass gasification in a fluidized bed reactor using ASPEN PLUS. *Renewable Energy*, 101(Supplement C), 629-636. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2016.09.011>
- Keche, A. J., Gaddale, A. P. R., Tated, R. G. J. C. T., & Policy, E. (2015). Simulation of biomass gasification in downdraft gasifier for different biomass fuels using ASPEN PLUS. 17(2), 465-473.
- Kennes, D., Abubackar, H. N., Diaz, M., Veiga, M. C., & Kennes, C. (2016). Bioethanol production from biomass: carbohydrate vs syngas fermentation. *Journal of Chemical Technology & Biotechnology*, 91(2), 304-317. doi:10.1002/jctb.4842
- Khatun, F., Monir, M. M. U., Arham, S. N., & Wahid, Z. (2016). Implementation of Carbon Dioxide Gas Injection Method for Gas Recovery at Rashidpur Gas Field, Bangladesh. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY AND SCIENCES (IJETS)*, 5(1), 52-61.
- Kim, K. H., Eom, I. Y., Lee, S. M., Choi, D., Yeo, H., Choi, I.-G., & Choi, J. W. (2011). Investigation of physicochemical properties of biooils produced from yellow poplar wood (*Liriodendron tulipifera*) at various temperatures and residence times. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 92(1), 2-9. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2011.04.002>
- Kim, Y.-K., Park, S. E., Lee, H., & Yun, J. Y. (2014). Enhancement of bioethanol production in syngas fermentation with *Clostridium ljungdahlii* using nanoparticles. *Bioresource Technology*, 159, 446-450.
- Konur, O. (2018). *Bioenergy and Biofuels*: CRC Press.
- Kuba, M., & Hofbauer, H. (2018). Experimental parametric study on product gas and tar composition in dual fluid bed gasification of woody biomass. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 115, 35-44. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.04.007>
- Kumabe, K., Hanaoka, T., Fujimoto, S., Minowa, T., & Sakanishi, K. (2007). Co-gasification of woody biomass and coal with air and steam. *Fuel*, 86(5), 684-689.
- Kumar, U., & Paul, M. C. (2019). CFD modelling of biomass gasification with a volatile break-up approach. *Chemical Engineering Science*, 195, 413-422. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ces.2018.09.038>
- Kundu, K., Chatterjee, A., Bhattacharyya, T., Roy, M., & Kaur, A. (2018). Thermochemical Conversion of Biomass to Bioenergy: A Review. In A. P. Singh, R. A. Agarwal, A. K. Agarwal, A. Dhar, & M. K. Shukla (Eds.), *Prospects of Alternative Transportation Fuels* (pp. 235-268). Singapore: Springer Singapore.

- Kuo, P.-C., Chen, H.-T., & Wu, W. (2014). Heat Integration of Biomass Co-firing in Coal Power Plant. *Energy Procedia*, 61, 1756-1759. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.12.205>
- Kurniawan, R., & Managi, S. (2018). Coal consumption, urbanization, and trade openness linkage in Indonesia. *Energy Policy*, 121, 576-583. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.07.023>
- Ladisch, M. R., Mosier, N. S., Youngmi, K. I. M., Ximenes, E., & Hogsett, D. (2010). Converting cellulose to biofuels. *Chemical Engineering Progress*, 106(3), 56-63. Retrieved from <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-77950199195&partnerID=40&md5=98a34793da78529e418475784876e345>
- Lagoa-Costa, B., Abubackar, H. N., Fernández-Romasanta, M., Kennes, C., & Veiga, M. C. (2017). Integrated bioconversion of syngas into bioethanol and biopolymers. *Bioresource Technology*, 239, 244-249.
- Lauri, P., Havlik, P., Kindermann, G., Forsell, N., Bottcher, H., & Obersteiner, M. (2014). Woody biomass energy potential in 2050. *Energy Policy*, 66, 19-31. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2013.11.033
- Lee, S., Speight, J. G., & Loyalka, S. K. (2014). *Handbook of alternative fuel technologies*: crc Press.
- Lewis, R. S., Tanner, R. S., & Huhnke, R. L. (2007). Indirect or direct fermentation of biomass to fuel alcohol. In: Google Patents.
- Li, H.-d., Tian, X.-l., & Dong, S.-l. (2019). Growth performance, non-specific immunity, intestinal histology and disease resistance of *Litopenaeus vannamei* fed on a diet supplemented with live cells of *Clostridium butyricum*. *Aquaculture*, 498, 470-481. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aquaculture.2018.09.003>
- Liao, J. C., Mi, L., Pontrelli, S., & Luo, S. (2016). Fuelling the future: microbial engineering for the production of sustainable biofuels. *Nat Rev Micro*, 14(5), 288-304. doi:10.1038/nrmicro.2016.32
- Liew, F., Henstra, A. M., Köpke, M., Winzer, K., Simpson, S. D., & Minton, N. P. (2017). Metabolic engineering of *Clostridium autoethanogenum* for selective alcohol production. *Metabolic engineering*, 40, 104-114. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ymben.2017.01.007>
- Limayem, A., & Ricke, S. C. (2012). Lignocellulosic biomass for bioethanol production: Current perspectives, potential issues and future prospects. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 38(4), 449-467. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2012.03.002>
- Lin, G., Yang, H., Wang, X., Mei, Y., Li, P., Shao, J., & Chen, H. (2016). The moisture sorption characteristics and modelling of agricultural biomass. *Biosystems Engineering*, 150, 191-200. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2016.08.006>

- Lin, Y., Zhang, W., Li, C., Sakakibara, K., Tanaka, S., & Kong, H. (2012). Factors affecting ethanol fermentation using *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* BY4742. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 47, 395-401. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.09.019>
- Liu, C.-F., Ren, J.-L., Xu, F., Liu, J.-J., Sun, J.-X., & Sun, R.-C. (2006). Isolation and characterization of cellulose obtained from ultrasonic irradiated sugarcane bagasse. *Journal of agricultural and food chemistry*, 54(16), 5742-5748.
- Loh, S. K. (2017). The potential of the Malaysian oil palm biomass as a renewable energy source. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 141, 285-298. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2016.08.081>
- Longhin, E., Gualtieri, M., Capasso, L., Bengalli, R., Mollerup, S., Holme, J. A., . . . Camatini, M. (2016). Physico-chemical properties and biological effects of diesel and biomass particles. *Environmental Pollution*, 215, 366-375. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envpol.2016.05.015>
- Lü, J., Sheahan, C., & Fu, P. (2011). Metabolic engineering of algae for fourth generation biofuels production. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 4(7), 2451-2466.
- Malek, A. A., Hasanuzzaman, M., Rahim, N. A., & Al Turki, Y. A. (2017). Techno-economic analysis and environmental impact assessment of a 10 MW biomass-based power plant in Malaysia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 141, 502-513.
- Mansfield, A. B., & Wooldridge, M. S. (2015). The effect of impurities on syngas combustion. *Combustion and Flame*, 162(5), 2286-2295. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.combustflame.2015.01.026>
- Mathieu, P., & Dubuisson, R. (2002). Performance analysis of a biomass gasifier. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 43(9-12), 1291-1299.
- Matsushika, A., Inoue, H., Kodaki, T., & Sawayama, S. (2009). Ethanol production from xylose in engineered *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* strains: current state and perspectives. *Applied Microbiology and Biotechnology*, 84(1), 37-53.
- Mehrpooya, M., Khalili, M., & Sharifzadeh, M. M. M. (2018). Model development and energy and exergy analysis of the biomass gasification process (Based on the various biomass sources). *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 91, 869-887. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.076>
- Meng, A., Zhou, H., Qin, L., Zhang, Y., & Li, Q. (2013). Quantitative and kinetic TG-FTIR investigation on three kinds of biomass pyrolysis. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 104, 28-37. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2013.09.013>
- Michel, R., Rapagnà, S., Burg, P., Mazziotti di Celso, G., Courson, C., Zimny, T., & Gruber, R. (2011). Steam gasification of *Miscanthus X Giganteus* with olivine as catalyst production of syngas and analysis of tars (IR, NMR and GC/MS). *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 35(7), 2650-2658. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.02.054>

- Mikulcic, H., Klemeš, J. J., Vujanovic, M., Urbaniec, K., & Duic, N. (2016). Reducing greenhouse gasses emissions by fostering the deployment of alternative raw materials and energy sources in the cleaner cement manufacturing process. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 30, 1e14.
- Moghadam, R. A., Yusup, S., Uemura, Y., Chin, B. L. F., Lam, H. L., & Al Shoaibi, A. (2014). Syngas production from palm kernel shell and polyethylene waste blend in fluidized bed catalytic steam co-gasification process. *Energy*, 75, 40-44. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2014.04.062
- Mohamad Ros, S. H., Islam, M. S., Rahman, M. L., Rashid, S. S., Chowdhury, Z. Z., Ali, M. E., & Sarkar, S. M. (2016). *Highly Active and Reusable Kenaf Cellulose Supported Bio-Poly(hydroxamic acid) Functionalized Copper Catalysts for C–N Bond Formation Reactions* (Vol. 12).
- Mohd Azhar, S. H., Abdulla, R., Jambo, S. A., Marbawi, H., Gansau, J. A., Mohd Faik, A. A., & Rodrigues, K. F. (2017). Yeasts in sustainable bioethanol production: A review. *Biochemistry and Biophysics Reports*, 10, 52-61. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bbrep.2017.03.003
- Molino, A., Chianese, S., & Musmarra, D. (2016). Biomass gasification technology: The state of the art overview. *Journal of Energy Chemistry*, 25(1), 10-25.
- Molino, A., Larocca, V., Chianese, S., & Musmarra, D. (2018). Biofuels production by biomass gasification: A review. *Energies*, 11(4), 811.
- Molitor, B., Marcellin, E., & Angenent, L. T. (2017). Overcoming the energetic limitations of syngas fermentation. *Current Opinion in Chemical Biology*, 41, 84-92. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cbpa.2017.10.003
- Monir, M. U., Abd Aziz, A., Kristanti, R. A., & Yousuf, A. (2018a). Co-gasification of empty fruit bunch in a downdraft reactor: A pilot scale approach. *Bioresource Technology Reports*, 1, 39-49. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biteb.2018.02.001
- Monir, M. U., Abd Aziz, A., Kristanti, R. A., & Yousuf, A. (2018b). Gasification of lignocellulosic biomass to produce syngas in a 50 kW downdraft reactor. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 119, 335-345. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.10.006
- Monir, M. U., Abd Aziz, A., Kristanti, R. A., & Yousuf, A. (2018c). Syngas Production from Co-gasification of Forest Residue and Charcoal in a Pilot Scale Downdraft Reactor. *Waste and Biomass Valorization*. doi:10.1007/s12649-018-0513-5
- Monir, M. U., Yousuf, A., Aziz, A. A., & Atnaw, S. M. (2017). Enhancing Co-Gasification of Coconut Shell by Reusing Char. *Indian Journal of Science and Technology*, 10(6), 1-4. doi:10.17485/ijst/2017/v10i6/111217
- Moon, J., Jo, W., Jeong, S., Bang, B., Choi, Y., Hwang, J., & Lee, U. (2017). Gas cleaning with molten tin for hydrogen sulfide and tar in producer gas generated from

biomass gasification. *Energy*, 130, 318-326.
doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.04.121>

- Morero, B., Groppelli, E. S., & Campanella, E. A. (2017). Evaluation of biogas upgrading technologies using a response surface methodology for process simulation. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 141, 978-988.
- Moriarty, P., & Honnery, D. (2019). 6 - Global renewable energy resources and use in 2050. In T. M. Letcher (Ed.), *Managing Global Warming* (pp. 221-235): Academic Press.
- Mujah, D. (2016). Compressive strength and chloride resistance of grout containing ground palm oil fuel ash. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 112, Part 1, 712-722. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.07.066>
- Munasinghe, P. C., & Khanal, S. K. (2011a). Biomass-derived syngas fermentation into biofuels. *Biofuels*, 101(13), 79-98.
- Munasinghe, P. C., & Khanal, S. K. (2011b). Chapter 4 - Biomass-derived Syngas Fermentation into Biofuels A2 - Pandey, Ashok. In C. Larroche, S. C. Ricke, C.-G. Dussap, & E. Gnansounou (Eds.), *Biofuels* (pp. 79-98). Amsterdam: Academic Press.
- Naik, S. N., Goud, V. V., Rout, P. K., & Dalai, A. K. (2010). Production of first and second generation biofuels: a comprehensive review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 14(2), 578-597.
- Ng, W. C., You, S., Ling, R., Gin, K. Y.-H., Dai, Y., & Wang, C.-H. (2017). Co-gasification of woody biomass and chicken manure: Syngas production, biochar reutilization, and cost-benefit analysis. *Energy*, 139(Supplement C), 732-742. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2017.07.165>
- Nigam, P. S., & Singh, A. (2011). Production of liquid biofuels from renewable resources. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 37(1), 52-68.
- Nikoo, M. B., & Mahinpey, N. (2008). Simulation of biomass gasification in fluidized bed reactor using ASPEN PLUS. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 32(12), 1245-1254. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2008.02.020>
- Nwokolo, N., Mamphweli, S., & Makaka, G. (2016). An investigation into heat recovery from the surface of a cyclone dust collector attached to a downdraft biomass gasifier. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 98(Supplement C), 1158-1164. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2016.01.014>
- Oakey, J. (2015). *Fuel Flexible Energy Generation: Solid, Liquid and Gaseous Fuels*: Woodhead Publishing.
- Oh, G., Ra, H. W., Yoon, S. M., Mun, T. Y., Seo, M. W., Lee, J. G., & Yoon, S. J. (2018). Gasification of coal water mixture in an entrained-flow gasifier: Effect of air and

- oxygen mixing ratio. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 129(Supplement C), 657-664. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2017.10.055>
- Osman, N., Othman, H. T., Karim, R. A., & Mazlan, M. A. F. (2014). Biomass in Malaysia: Forestry-based residues. *Int J Biomass Renew*, 3, 7-14.
- Oumer, A. N., Hasan, M. M., Baheta, A. T., Mamat, R., & Abdullah, A. A. (2018). Bio-based liquid fuels as a source of renewable energy: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 88, 82-98. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.02.022>
- Ozturk, M., Saba, N., Altay, V., Iqbal, R., Hakeem, K. R., Jawaid, M., & Ibrahim, F. H. (2017). Biomass and bioenergy: An overview of the development potential in Turkey and Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 79, 1285-1302. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.05.111>
- Paiman, M., Hamzah, N., Idris, S., Rahman, N., & Ismail, K. (2018). *Synergistic Effect of Co-utilization of Coal and Biomass Char: An Overview*. Paper presented at the IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and Engineering.
- Pallozzi, V., Di Carlo, A., Bocci, E., & Carlini, M. (2018). Combined gas conditioning and cleaning for reduction of tars in biomass gasification. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 109, 85-90. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.12.023>
- Pambudi, N. A., Itaoka, K., Chapman, A., & Dinh, N. Biomass energy in Japan: Current status and future potential.
- Patel, V. R., Patel, D., Varia, N., & Patel, R. N. (2017). Co-gasification of lignite and waste wood in a pilot-scale (10 kW_e) downdraft gasifier. *Energy*, 119, 834-844. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2016.11.057>
- Patra, T. K., & Sheth, P. N. (2015). Biomass gasification models for downdraft gasifier: A state-of-the-art review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 50, 583-593.
- Peters, J. F., Banks, S. W., Bridgwater, A. V., & Dufour, J. (2017). A kinetic reaction model for biomass pyrolysis processes in ASPEN Plus. *Applied Energy*, 188, 595-603.
- Phillips, J. R., Huhnke, R. L., & Atiyeh, H. K. (2017). Syngas fermentation: a microbial conversion process of gaseous substrates to various products. *Fermentation*, 3(2), 28.
- Prapakarn, S., Arjharn, W., Liplap, P., Prapakarn, N., & Hinsui, T. (2017). Effect of Steam on the Energy and Activated Carbon Production of A Pilot-Scale Downdraft Steam Co-Gasification. *Oriental Journal of Chemistry*, 33(5), 2443-2451.

- Prasertcharoensuk, P., Hernandez, D. A., Bull, S. J., & Phan, A. N. (2018). Optimisation of a throat downdraft gasifier for hydrogen production. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 116, 216-226. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2018.06.019>
- Prins, M. J., & Ptasiński, K. J. (2005). Energy and exergy analyses of the oxidation and gasification of carbon. *Energy*, 30(7), 982-1002. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2004.08.010>
- Qin, Y.-h., Han, Q.-q., Zhao, Z.-b., Du, Z.-y., Feng, J., Li, W.-y., . . . Vassileva, C. G. (2017). Impact of biomass addition on organic structure and mineral matter of char during coal-biomass co-gasification under CO₂ atmosphere. *Fuel*, 202, 556-562. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2017.04.072>
- Rakesh, N., & Dasappa, S. (2018). A critical assessment of tar generated during biomass gasification - Formation, evaluation, issues and mitigation strategies. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 91, 1045-1064. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.04.017>
- Ramani, S., Allison, J. D., & Keller, A. E. (2004). Controlling syngas H₂: CO ratio by controlling feed hydrocarbon composition. In: Google Patents.
- Ramos, A., Monteiro, E., Silva, V., & Rouboa, A. (2018). Co-gasification and recent developments on waste-to-energy conversion: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 81, 380-398.
- Rastogi, M., & Shrivastava, S. (2017). Recent advances in second generation bioethanol production: An insight to pretreatment, saccharification and fermentation processes. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 80, 330-340.
- Rathod, V., & Bhale, P. V. (2014). Experimental Investigation on Biogas Reforming for Syngas Production over an Alumina based Nickel Catalyst. *Energy Procedia*, 54, 236-245. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.egypro.2014.07.267>
- Rathod, V. P., Shete, J., & Bhale, P. V. (2016). Experimental investigation on biogas reforming to hydrogen rich syngas production using solar energy. *International journal of hydrogen energy*, 41(1), 132-138. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhydene.2015.09.158>
- Rauch, R., Hrbek, J., & Hofbauer, H. (2014). Biomass gasification for synthesis gas production and applications of the syngas. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Energy and Environment*, 3(4), 343-362.
- Reddy, B. R., & Vinu, R. (2018). Feedstock Characterization for Pyrolysis and Gasification. In *Coal and Biomass Gasification* (pp. 3-36): Springer.
- Richardson, Y., Drobek, M., Julbe, A., Blin, J., & Pinta, F. (2015). Biomass gasification to produce syngas. *Recent Advances in Thermo-chemical Conversion of Biomass*.
- Roy, D., & Ghosh, S. (2017). Energy and exergy analyses of an integrated biomass gasification combined cycle employing solid oxide fuel cell and organic Rankine

- cycle. *Clean Technologies and Environmental Policy*, 19(6), 1693-1709.
doi:10.1007/s10098-017-1358-5
- Ruiz, B., Girón, R. P., Suárez-Ruiz, I., & Fuente, E. (2017). From fly ash of forest biomass combustion (FBC) to micro-mesoporous silica adsorbent materials. *Process Safety and Environmental Protection*, 105, 164-174.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psep.2016.11.005
- Sadhukhan, J., Martinez-Hernandez, E., Murphy, R. J., Ng, D. K. S., Hassim, M. H., Siew Ng, K., . . . Andiappan, V. (2018). Role of bioenergy, biorefinery and bioeconomy in sustainable development: Strategic pathways for Malaysia. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 81, 1966-1987.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.06.007
- Sadhukhan, J., Ng, K. S., & Hernandez, E. M. (2014). *Biorefineries and chemical processes: design, integration and sustainability analysis*: John Wiley & Sons.
- Sadhwani, N., Adhikari, S., Eden, M. R., & Li, P. (2018). Aspen plus simulation to predict steady state performance of biomass - CO₂ gasification in a fluidized bed gasifier. *Biofuels, Bioproducts and Biorefining*, 12(3), 379-389.
- Sakai, S., Nakashimada, Y., Yoshimoto, H., Watanabe, S., Okada, H., & Nishio, N. (2004). Ethanol production from H₂ and CO₂ by a newly isolated thermophilic bacterium, *Moorella* sp. HUC22-1. *Biotechnology letters*, 26(20), 1607-1612.
- Samiran, N. A., Jaafar, M. N. M., Ng, J.-H., Lam, S. S., & Chong, C. T. (2016). Progress in biomass gasification technique – With focus on Malaysian palm biomass for syngas production. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 62, 1047-1062.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2016.04.049
- Sansaniwal, S. K., Pal, K., Rosen, M. A., & Tyagi, S. K. (2017). Recent advances in the development of biomass gasification technology: A comprehensive review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 72, 363-384.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2017.01.038
- Saravanakumar, K., Senthilraja, P., & Kathiresan, K. (2013). Bioethanol production by mangrove-derived marine yeast, *Saccharomyces cerevisiae*. *Journal of King Saud University - Science*, 25(2), 121-127.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksus.2012.12.005
- Sarkar, S. M., & Rahman, M. L. (2017). Cellulose supported poly(amidoxime) copper complex for Click reaction. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 141, 683-692.
doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.09.153
- Sarrai, A., Hanini, S., Merzouk, N., Tassalit, D., Szabó, T., Hernádi, K., & Nagy, L. (2016). Using central composite experimental design to optimize the degradation of tylosin from aqueous solution by photo-fenton reaction. *Materials*, 9(6), 428.
- Saw, W. L., & Pang, S. (2013). Co-gasification of blended lignite and wood pellets in a 100kW dual fluidised bed steam gasifier: The influence of lignite ratio on

- producer gas composition and tar content. *Fuel*, 112, 117-124. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2013.05.019>
- Sayed, E. T., & Abdelkareem, M. A. (2017). Yeast as a Biocatalyst in Microbial Fuel Cell. In *Old Yeasts-New Questions*: InTech.
- Searle, S., & Malins, C. (2015). A reassessment of global bioenergy potential in 2050. *Gcb Bioenergy*, 7(2), 328-336.
- Serrano-Ruiz, J. C. (2017). Biomass Conversion Technologies: Catalytic Conversion Technologies. In M. Rabaçal, A. F. Ferreira, C. A. M. Silva, & M. Costa (Eds.), *Biorefineries: Targeting Energy, High Value Products and Waste Valorisation* (pp. 113-121). Cham: Springer International Publishing.
- Shahbaz, M., Yusup, S., Inayat, D. A., Ammar, M., Patrick, D. O., Pratama, A., & Naqvi, S. R. (2017). Syngas production from steam gasification of Palm kernel shell with subsequent CO₂ Capturing using CaO sorbent: An Aspen plus modelling. *Energy & Fuels*. doi:10.1021/acs.energyfuels.7b02670
- Shankar, S., & Shikha. (2017). Renewable and Nonrenewable Energy Resources: Bioenergy and Biofuels. In R. L. Singh (Ed.), *Principles and Applications of Environmental Biotechnology for a Sustainable Future* (pp. 293-314). Singapore: Springer Singapore.
- Sharma, M., Attanoor, S., & Dasappa, S. (2015). Investigation into co-gasifying Indian coal and biomass in a down draft gasifier—Experiments and analysis. *Fuel Processing Technology*, 138, 435-444.
- Shayan, E., Zare, V., & Mirzaee, I. (2018). Hydrogen production from biomass gasification; a theoretical comparison of using different gasification agents. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 159, 30-41. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2017.12.096>
- Shen, Y., Brown, R., & Wen, Z. (2014a). Enhancing mass transfer and ethanol production in syngas fermentation of *Clostridium carboxidivorans* P7 through a monolithic biofilm reactor. *Applied Energy*, 136, 68-76. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2014.08.117>
- Shen, Y., Brown, R., & Wen, Z. (2014b). Syngas fermentation of *Clostridium carboxidivoran* P7 in a hollow fiber membrane biofilm reactor: Evaluating the mass transfer coefficient and ethanol production performance. *Biochemical Engineering Journal*, 85, 21-29.
- Shen, Y., Brown, R. C., & Wen, Z. (2017). Syngas fermentation by *Clostridium carboxidivorans* P7 in a horizontal rotating packed bed biofilm reactor with enhanced ethanol production. *Applied Energy*, 187, 585-594. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.11.084>

- Shone, C. M., & Jothi, T. J. S. (2016). Preparation of gasification feedstock from leafy biomass. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 23(10), 9364-9372. doi:10.1007/s11356-015-5167-2
- Sikarwar, V. S., Zhao, M., Clough, P., Yao, J., Zhong, X., Memon, M. Z., . . . Fennell, P. S. (2016). An overview of advances in biomass gasification. *Energy & Environmental Science*, 9(10), 2939-2977. doi:10.1039/C6EE00935B
- Sikarwar, V. S., Zhao, M., Fennell, P. S., Shah, N., & Anthony, E. J. (2017). Progress in biofuel production from gasification. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 61, 189-248. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2017.04.001
- Singh, V. C. J., & Sekhar, S. J. (2016). Performance studies on a downdraft biomass gasifier with blends of coconut shell and rubber seed shell as feedstock. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 97, 22-27. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applthermaleng.2015.09.099
- Singh, Y. D., Mahanta, P., & Bora, U. (2017). Comprehensive characterization of lignocellulosic biomass through proximate, ultimate and compositional analysis for bioenergy production. *Renewable Energy*, 103, 490-500.
- Singha, A. S., & Guleria, A. (2015). Utility of chemically modified agricultural waste okra biomass for removal of toxic heavy metal ions from aqueous solution. *Engineering in Agriculture, Environment and Food*, 8(1), 52-60. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eaef.2014.08.001
- Smith, M. W., Pecha, B., Helms, G., Scudiero, L., & Garcia-Perez, M. (2017). Chemical and morphological evaluation of chars produced from primary biomass constituents: Cellulose, xylan, and lignin. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 104, 17-35. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.05.015
- Speight, J. G. (2011). *The biofuels handbook*: Royal Society of Chemistry.
- Stitt, E. H. (2002). Alternative multiphase reactors for fine chemicals: A world beyond stirred tanks? *Chemical Engineering Journal*, 90(1), 47-60. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S1385-8947(02)00067-0
- Sun, X., Atiyeh, H. K., Kumar, A., & Zhang, H. (2018). Enhanced ethanol production by *Clostridium ragsdalei* from syngas by incorporating biochar in the fermentation medium. *Bioresource Technology*, 247, 291-301. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2017.09.060
- Sun, X., Atiyeh, H. K., Kumar, A., Zhang, H., & Tanner, R. S. J. B. t. (2018). Biochar enhanced ethanol and butanol production by *Clostridium carboxidivorans* from syngas. 265, 128-138.
- Susastriawan, A., & Saptoadi, H. (2017). Small-scale downdraft gasifiers for biomass gasification: A review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 76, 989-1003.

- Suzuki, K., Tsuji, N., Shirai, Y., Hassan, M. A., & Osaki, M. (2017). Evaluation of biomass energy potential towards achieving sustainability in biomass energy utilization in Sabah, Malaysia. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 97, 149-154. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2016.12.023
- Tian, L., Papanek, B., Olson, D. G., Rydzak, T., Holwerda, E. K., Zheng, T., . . . Giannone, R. J. (2016). Simultaneous achievement of high ethanol yield and titer in *Clostridium thermocellum*. *Biotechnology for biofuels*, 9(1), 116.
- Titirici, M.-M., Antonietti, M., & Thomas, A. (2006). A generalized synthesis of metal oxide hollow spheres using a hydrothermal approach. *Chemistry of Materials*, 18(16), 3808-3812.
- Toklu, E. (2017). Biomass energy potential and utilization in Turkey. *Renewable Energy*, 107, 235-244. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.02.008
- Tsai, W. T., Lee, M. K., & Chang, Y. M. (2006). Fast pyrolysis of rice straw, sugarcane bagasse and coconut shell in an induction-heating reactor. *Journal of Analytical and Applied Pyrolysis*, 76(1), 230-237. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaap.2005.11.007
- Tsuchida, Y., Tsukagoshi, N., & Ueyama, M. (2017). Growth method for microbe and bioethanol production method. In: Google Patents.
- Unyaphan, S., Tarnpradab, T., Takahashi, F., & Yoshikawa, K. (2017). Improvement of tar removal performance of oil scrubber by producing syngas microbubbles. *Applied Energy*, 205, 802-812. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2017.08.071
- Valderrama Rios, M. L., González, A. M., Lora, E. E. S., & Almazán del Olmo, O. A. (2018). Reduction of tar generated during biomass gasification: A review. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 108, 345-370. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2017.12.002
- Valdés, C. F., Marrugo, G., Chejne, F., Montoya, J. I., & Gómez, C. A. (2015). Pilot-scale fluidized-bed co-gasification of palm kernel shell with sub-bituminous coal. *Energy & Fuels*, 29(9), 5894-5901.
- Vassilev, S. V., Vassileva, C. G., & Vassilev, V. S. (2015). Advantages and disadvantages of composition and properties of biomass in comparison with coal: An overview. *Fuel*, 158, 330-350. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2015.05.050
- Vinícius de Melo Pereira, G., Soccol, V. T., Brar, S. K., Neto, E., & Soccol, C. R. (2017). Microbial ecology and starter culture technology in coffee processing. *Critical reviews in food science nutrition*, 57(13), 2775-2788.
- Wang, D., Geng, Z., Li, B., & Zhang, C. (2015). High performance electrode materials for electric double-layer capacitors based on biomass-derived activated carbons. *Electrochimica Acta*, 173(Supplement C), 377-384. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electacta.2015.05.080

- Wang, P., Jin, L., Liu, J., Zhu, S., & Hu, H. (2013). Analysis of coal tar derived from pyrolysis at different atmospheres. *Fuel*, 104, 14-21. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2010.06.041
- Wang, S., Dai, G., Yang, H., & Luo, Z. (2017). Lignocellulosic biomass pyrolysis mechanism: A state-of-the-art review. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 62, 33-86. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pecs.2017.05.004
- Wang, S. R., Dai, G. X., Yang, H. P., & Luo, Z. Y. (2017). Lignocellulosic biomass pyrolysis mechanism: A state-of-the-art review. *Progress in Energy and Combustion Science*, 62, 33-86. doi:10.1016/j.pecs.2017.05.004
- Wei, L. (2005). Experimental study on the effects of operational parameters of a downdraft gasifier. *Masters Abstracts International*, 47(01).
- Widjaya, E. R., Chen, G., Bowtell, L., & Hills, C. (2018). Gasification of non-woody biomass: A literature review. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 89, 184-193. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2018.03.023
- Wyman, C. E. (2018). Ethanol production from lignocellulosic biomass: overview. In *Handbook on Bioethanol* (pp. 1-18): Routledge.
- Xu, D., Tree, D. R., & Lewis, R. S. (2011). The effects of syngas impurities on syngas fermentation to liquid fuels. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 35(7), 2690-2696. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2011.03.005
- Xu, H., Liang, C., Yuan, Z., Xu, J., Hua, Q., & Guo, Y. (2017). A study of CO/syngas bioconversion by *Clostridium autoethanogenum* with a flexible gas-cultivation system. *Enzyme and Microbial Technology*, 101, 24-29.
- Xu, N., Kim, S. S., Li, A., Grace, J. R., Lim, C. J., & Boyd, T. (2016). Investigation of the influence of tar-containing syngas from biomass gasification on dense Pd and Pd-Ru membranes. *Powder Technology*, 290, 132-140.
- Yang, H., & Chen, H. (2015). 11 - Biomass gasification for synthetic liquid fuel production A2 - Luque, Rafael. In J. G. Speight (Ed.), *Gasification for Synthetic Fuel Production* (pp. 241-275): Woodhead Publishing.
- Yi, Q., Qi, F., Cheng, G., Zhang, Y., Xiao, B., Hu, Z., . . . Xu, S. (2013). Thermogravimetric analysis of co-combustion of biomass and biochar. *Journal of Thermal Analysis and Calorimetry*, 112(3), 1475-1479. doi:10.1007/s10973-012-2744-1
- Yoo, H.-M., Lee, J.-S., Yang, W.-S., Choi, H. S., Jang, H.-N., & Seo, Y.-C. (2018). Co-gasification characteristics of palm oil by-products and coals for syngas production. *Korean Journal of Chemical Engineering*, 35(3), 654-661. doi:10.1007/s11814-017-0312-x

- Yu, J., Paterson, N., Blamey, J., & Millan, M. (2017). Cellulose, xylan and lignin interactions during pyrolysis of lignocellulosic biomass. *Fuel*, 191, 140-149. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2016.11.057>
- Zhang, J., Choi, Y. S., Yoo, C. G., Kim, T. H., Brown, R. C., & Shanks, B. H. (2015). Cellulose–hemicellulose and cellulose–lignin interactions during fast pyrolysis. *ACS Sustainable Chemistry & Engineering*, 3(2), 293-301.
- Zhang, J., Taylor, S., & Wang, Y. (2016). Effects of end products on fermentation profiles in *Clostridium carboxidivorans* P7 for syngas fermentation. *Bioresource Technology*, 218, 1055-1063. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.biortech.2016.07.071>
- Zhang, Y., Zhao, Y., Gao, X., Li, B., & Huang, J. (2015). Energy and exergy analyses of syngas produced from rice husk gasification in an entrained flow reactor. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 95, 273-280. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2015.02.053>
- Zhang, Y., & Zheng, Y. (2016). Co-gasification of coal and biomass in a fixed bed reactor with separate and mixed bed configurations. *Fuel*, 183, 132-138. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.fuel.2016.06.066>
- Zhang, Z., Macquarrie, D. J., Budarin, V. L., Hunt, A. J., Gronnow, M. J., Fan, J., . . . Matharu, A. S. (2015). Low-temperature microwave-assisted pyrolysis of waste office paper and the application of bio-oil as an Al adhesive. *Green Chemistry*, 17(1), 260-270.
- Zhang, Z., Pang, S., & Levi, T. (2017). Influence of AAEM species in coal and biomass on steam co-gasification of chars of blended coal and biomass. *Renewable Energy*, 101, 356-363.
- Zhao, J., Lin, M., & Chen, G. (2018). Facile recycling of *Escherichia coli* and *Saccharomyces cerevisiae* cells from suspensions using magnetic modification method and mechanism analysis. *Colloids and Surfaces B: Biointerfaces*, 169, 1-9. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.colsurfb.2018.05.006>
- Zhou, C., Rosén, C., & Engvall, K. (2016). Biomass oxygen/steam gasification in a pressurized bubbling fluidized bed: Agglomeration behavior. *Applied Energy*, 172, 230-250. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.apenergy.2016.03.106>
- Zuriarrain, A., Zuriarrain, J., Villar, M., & Berregi, I. (2015). Quantitative determination of ethanol in cider by ¹H NMR spectrometry. *Food Control*, 50, 758-762. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.foodcont.2014.10.024>